

Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, with amendment. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 13-18 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 13-18. No claims have been cancelled or added in this Amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the final Office Action mailed October 20, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner noted the description of the oar as having a scull blade joined to a scull arm is clear, but that a substantial part of the scull blade is not in the configuration of a blade as shown in Fig. 1(a) while the whole arm 2 is defined as the scull blade. As such, the Examiner indicated this creates confusion as to which part of the oar is the scull blade.

The Applicant has amended the claims to be more clearer as to which part of the oar is the scull blade. Particularly, the Applicant has amended the claims such that, in the appropriate places, the terms “scull arm” (corresponding to #1 in FIG. 1) has been changed to –first scull arm–; “scull blade” (corresponding to #2 in FIG. 1) has been changed to –second scull arm–; and “flat part” (corresponding to #12 in FIG. 1) has been changed to –flat scull blade–. The Applicant has similarly amended a few portions of the specification.

The Examiner indicated the recitation in claim 14 that the scull blade is joined to a connection part “near a distal end portion at one end not joined to the scull blade” is confusing. The Applicant has amended claim 14 to address the Examiner’s concerns regarding claim 14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 13-18 presented herein meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
ATSUSHI DOI
By _____
James N. Kallis
Reg. No. 41,102
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 27, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351